

Appl. No.: 10/644,841

Reply to Office action of Aug. 30, 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. In response to your office action of Aug. 30, 2007, I would like to explain that, as I told you on the phone at the beginning of Sep. 2007, it is certainly not correct that my reply contained only claims drawn to a non-elected invention, since I elected the first species which you listed - a security system authorizing access to data as a result of disk related actions, and as I indicated already in my previous reply, a large number of claims belong to this species: at least claims 1-5, 9-15, 20, 22, 28, 37, 42, 43, 46, 56, 58, 60-64, 66, 67, 69-86, 88, 90-93. For example, claim 2 clearly talks about monitoring the storage devices and about a database of security rules and authorizations, claim 3 talks again about this database, claim 4 again mentions the storage devices, claim 5 again clearly mentions the storage devices, claims 10-12 are the method equivalents of claims 2-4, claims 13, 73, 74, 75 and equivalent method claims 14, 80, 81, 82 (which were also repeated in clauses f-h of claims 1 & 9) clearly talk about the storage devices and also mention specifically files and directories, claims 70 & 71 and equivalent method claims 77 & 78 (which were also repeated in clauses c & d of claims 1 & 9) clearly talk about the hard disks and other storage media, claim 72 & equivalent method claim 79 (which were also repeated in clause e of claims 1 & 9) clearly talk about the storage devices and the file system, claim 20 and equivalent method claim 83 (which were also repeated in clause i of claims 1 & 9) clearly talk about files and the storage devices, etc. In fact most of the claims that were canceled were claims which clearly belonged to the other – nonelected – species, and especially claims that dealt with communications devices. And most of the new claims which I added belong to the selected species. In addition, as I explained to you on the phone, the claims were amended mainly because the amended set of claims is a much better set of claims **which are much more clear and improved after a lot of work as a result of responding to multiple office actions in England** on the equivalent parallel applications, and in fact these claims are a subset of claims that were already granted in England. Therefore, using this amended set of claim is much better and will save a lot of time and facilitate the examination process, whereas using the original set of claims would be very inefficient. And since there is no limitation on making such an amendment as

long as the claims are supported by the specification and it is before a final action, I respectfully request that you accept this amended set of claims.

2. However, to be on the safe side and make it easier for you, I have now amended claim 1 & equivalent method claim 9 to contain only one central feature, and I respectfully submit that these two claims should be regarded as generic claims.
3. Therefore, as elected already in my previous reply, in response to your required restriction to one of 4 “species”: A security system authorizing access to data as a result of disk related actions, communications related actions, Registry related actions, and memory related actions – we select the first species - A security system authorizing access to data as a result of disk actions. Many of the claims have been amended or replaced and most of the claims belong now to the first species. Therefore, the list of claims which belong to this species are at least claims 2-5, 10-15, 20, 22, 28, 37, 42, 43, 46, 56, 58, 60-64, 66, 67, 69-86, 88, 90-93. In addition, as far as I understand, at least the following dependent claims are generic and therefore I respectfully request that they should also be examined: 16, 19, 30, 38, 45, 50, 54, 87 & 94. In addition, I would like to request that since all the independent claims now refer to disk related activities and/or are generic, other species which might be mentioned in some parts of dependent claims should also be examined since they are now dependent on the independent claims and therefore there is no problem of unity of invention. In addition, I would like to remind you that you stated in clause 3 of your first office action that independent claims 1 & 9 are currently regarded as generic and that the restriction will apply only if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.
4. Any claims canceled or not elected are being canceled or not elected without prejudice and we reserve the right to reinstate them or other claims or other changes later in this application and/or in divisionals and/or in CIPs.

Respectfully submitted,

Yaron Mayer

/Yaron Mayer/

